

**Comment Submission 26**

**From:** "Rose, Donald L - KEC-4" <dltrose@bpa.gov>  
**To:** "Judith Hillis (E-mail)" <judithh@jsanet.com>, "Irina Makarow (E-mail)" <irinam@ep.cted.wa.gov>  
**Date:** 3/26/02 1:14PM  
**Subject:** Burbank comments

Additional comments we gathered on the flip chart in Burbank include:

- \* concern about birds flying into structures and lines. | 26-1
- \* question about why placing the line underground is not considered in the DEIS. | 26-2
- \* perhaps we could explain the cost effectiveness of burying 500-kV lines in the DEIS. | 26-3

Don Rose  
Environmental Specialist  
Bonneville Power Administration  
503-230-3796

**CC:** "Driessen, Laurens C - TNP-TPP-3" <ldriessen@bpa.gov>, "Berry, Theresa M - TNLC-TPP-3" <tmberry@bpa.gov>, "Doiron, Michelle - TRF/Walla Walla" <medoiron@bpa.gov>, "Ellis, Liz M - KEC-4" <emellis@bpa.gov>, "Whitney, Carolyn A - T-DITT2" <cawhitney@bpa.gov>, "Hilliard Creecy, Jamae - T-DITT2" <jlhilliard@bpa.gov>

**Responses to Comment Submission 26,  
Flip Chart Comments From Public Hearing at Burbank, WA**

- 26-1. Comment noted. Please see responses to comment submission 25.
- 26-2. Burying the transmission line was considered but dismissed early on primarily due to construction costs. Experience with buried transmission lines has shown decreased reliability and increased maintenance costs compared to overhead lines.
- 26-3. With a current cost of \$8 million to \$13 million per mile of line constructed, it is estimated that burying 500-kV transmission line is 10 to 15 times more expensive than overhead construction. Buried transmission lines are more difficult to maintain and have not been as reliable as overhead lines.